

**MINUTES
OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
EDINA PARK BOARD
HELD AT CITY HALL
FEBRUARY 10, 2015
7 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Gieseke called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Answering roll call were Members McCormick, Cella, Segreto, Gieseke, Steel, Jacobson, Jones
Student Members Chowdhury, Colwell
Member Greene arrived at 7:18 p.m.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Cella, approving the meeting agenda.

Ayes: McCormick, Cella, Segreto, Gieseke, Steel, Jacobson, Jones.
Motion carried.

IV. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Member Steel made a motion, seconded by Member Cella, approving the consent agenda as follows:

IV.A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Park Board Meeting of Tuesday, Jan. 13, 2015

Ayes: McCormick, Cella, Segreto, Gieseke, Steel, Jacobson, Jones.
Motion carried.

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

None

VI. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VI.A. Braemar Clubhouse Interior Renovations

Ann Kattreh gave the Park Board an update on the interior renovations at Braemar Clubhouse.

Member Jacobson asked if there will be outside seating. Ms. Kattreh replied they will have outside seating on the wrap-around patio and also hope to add a patio on the north side of the clubhouse to accommodate restaurant patrons as well. Member Segreto asked if that would be on the ground level to which Ms. Kattreh responded yes and added that there will be a nice view of the driving range and the first hole on the course.

Member Steel asked if there were plans to add art work to which Ms. Kattreh replied they do intend to jazz it up in a variety of different ways. She explained their goal in providing the design they did is try to attract a wide variety of users. They want to make it a pleasing environment to their current golf users as well as make it a friendly and inviting environment for families. She added they want people to bring their business customers to Braemar as well as accommodate wedding parties and other rentals. Their goal is to be as neutral as possible and be able to add art and different things that can be added or taken away if it does not meet the particular need of the rental at that time.

Member McCormick stated at one time there was discussion that they might do a portable dance floor but the plan shows it is a permanent dance floor. Ms. Kattreh explained that portable dances floors are a challenge and a big labor issue and therefore staff decided it should be permanent.

Member Segreto asked if the lease with Tin Fish has been finalized to which Ms. Kattreh replied yes, the lease took effect Jan. 1, 2015. Member Segreto asked what the hours of operation will be. Ms. Kattreh explained she is not sure of the exact times; however, there is a requirement that they need to be open a certain amount of time before and after the golf course is open and closed. Member Segreto asked about winter hours to which Ms. Kattreh replied the Tin Fish has guaranteed that they will be open during the winter.

Member Segreto asked if alcohol will be served to which Ms. Kattreh replied they will still be serving beer and wine. Member Segreto wondered if coffee will be served during the off hours for possible business meetings to which Ms. Kattreh responded yes.

Member Segreto asked if there was wiring for presentations for business meetings to which Ms. Kattreh replied yes, they will be putting in a brand new audio/visual system.

Member McCormick noted at the public open house there was some discussion about the televisions in the Tin Fish area and wondered what was determined. Ms. Kattreh pointed out the plan is to have the large TV on the south wall and add one or more TVs as well. She noted they are also talking about doing a closed circuit TV with Braemar Arena so if a parent drops a child off for practice at the arena they can come to the Tin Fish and watch their child on TV.

Member McCormick asked when the Tin Fish will be ready to open. Ms. Kattreh replied the Tin Fish just got their building permit today and they are anticipating a six-week construction time so they are hoping to have everything ready to go by April 15.

Member Segreto asked if the orange compartment shown in the layout relate to the furniture that was chosen. Ms. Kattreh indicated she was not sure if that is the actual color selection but will find out. Member Segreto commented she thought the orange could become outdated to which Ms. Kattreh agreed. Member McCormick asked if the colors of the wood represent what the actual colors will be. Ms. Kattreh responded the color of the wood in the layout does not represent the actual colors of the wood and added they are trying to figure out the best use of funds without gutting the entire facility.

Member Segreto asked if they are requiring the restaurant to recycle. Ms. Kattreh responded they are as well as the restaurant is only using compostable materials and will have food composting as well.

Member Jacobson asked if there is going to be any capability to order food from the outside such as a drive-up window to which Ms. Kattreh indicated they are pursuing a couple of things. She noted they are looking at adding a satellite location at the driving range building as well as envision taking fresh food there so residents would be able to bike up and grab something. At this location, they are also going to be exploring an app to order something and then pick it up to at a walk-up window.

Member Segreto asked how long the lease is to which Ms. Kattreh replied it is a five-year lease with a five-year option.

VI.B. Park System Strategic Planning

Mr. Terry Minarik from Confluence gave the Park Board an update on where they are at in the process with the Strategic Plan.

Member McCormick wondered if there is a purpose or vision statement that the plan points fall under that the Committee was working towards. Mr. Minarik stated what we are going to do now is take some of the guiding principles and give a definition of what they describe and what they are and those will become vision statements as well. They will also try to categorize those under a different heading. There will be more specific headings for each of the goals as they move forward. He stated a lot of the inventory and benchmark analysis will help them to define the goals.

Member Gieseke indicated he liked this but was a little confused and would like to envision what it will look like when it is done. He reviewed what he thought the order will be. Mr. Minarik stated Member Gieseke was right on target.

Member McCormick stated she had a couple of observations as she read the principles. She liked all of them and thought the group took all of the feedback and honed in on the meaning but she thought some of the wording needed to be cleaned up. "Promote Community Health and Wellness", she thought was completely objective but it seemed like the park system would be more of the focus on community health and wellness and thought that was missed. She thought they missed the park component of the recreational. She indicated it would be to promote recreational health and wellness because that is what their focus would be. The point on Strength & Financial Position was very broad and she was not sure what the objective would be. She asked if it would mean to be within budget or find new innovative ways to find funds for the park system. Ms. Kattreh stated that was correct. She thought they made it broad on purpose because some of the things mentioned they talked about. They talked about having appropriate budgets, cost recovery, anything that could be thought of from a financial perspective and that is why they made it as broad as they did. That was the intention.

Member McCormick thought someone should be able to read these and understand what they are trying to do. Mr. Minarik stated he understood and that is why they wanted to give this to the Board now before they finalize it. He thought they will define and refine them more as they move forward.

Member McCormick stated the Connect People to Places bullet was great with the trail system but thought that the transportation group would associate more with that and have that as their goal and the Park Board's goal would be more of connecting people to nature or to parks. She felt like these should be very specific as to what they want to do with their park system and not so broad that they are a community wide guide post. Mr. Minarik thought from discussions they probably ventured more towards wanting to do more with the parks and recreation component in the City, rather than just provide sports venues and recreational programs. They want it to be something that can contribute to health and wellness and connect people in the City, connect people to places. Through recreation and activity they could begin to connect people to other places than the sports field or the playground but also to other places such as the hospital or shopping mall. Via the trail people will have a healthier lifestyle because they will be walking, biking, running or doing something that gets them to move. He stated they are looking to be broad with this item. He stated it is all up to interpretation right now. Member McCormick wanted to make sure they are Park Board related goals. She also wondered how the maintenance fit in. Mr. Minarik thought it would be a part of the service excellence component and that would cover the maintenance.

Member Segreto asked how involved will the Park Board be in each step of the process as they get more detailed because what Member McCormick said was right. How do they make sure that the strategic plan does cover all the different areas that the member's feel are important. Mr. Minarik thought through the committee meetings and coming forward to the Park Board, providing the information they will give to the Board for review and comment will help and staff also has submitted some critical things they want to see get done through goals and objectives. A lot of their analysis will push forward where they are lacking and excelling within the park system, which will help them identify a lot of those goals and objectives. They will continue to submit reports to the Board for review and input until the Board approves the information as the final strategic plan for the park system.

Ms. Kattreh stated as they continue to meet as staff and a committee, staff would be more than happy to put together emails to the entire park board to update everyone as to the progress they are making at the committee meetings. The first few months the committee was in the data gathering mode and now they are starting to get to the principals and goal setting mode and will need the Park Board's input at this critical time. Member Segreto stated they do not want to burden the process but they do not want to find themselves towards the end of the process with a draft of the strategic plan and then each of the members questioning the plan. Ms. Kattreh agreed and indicated she wants as much input as she can get from the Park Board. Member Jones stated as a follow-up, there is a list of draft goals in the packet and it would be really useful if everyone on the Board would review the list and add their own goals. Mr. Minarik stated it is going to be very critical as they do identify all of these goals that the Board help them to establish what the priorities are. Some of the priorities are dictated just by need.

Member Steel stated they had talked about a park overlay as a part of the Comprehensive Plan and getting more park inclusion into their plan, this may be the start of getting something started so they are included in future Comprehensive Plans of the City. Ms. Kattreh agreed. She thought that was a great comment and they need to have discussion about how to include this information in the Comprehensive Plan. Member McCormick thought it was a good idea but they need to focus on what they are responsible for otherwise this plan will be too broad.

Member Gieseke noted there is a fine line and it is their time to have a vision on what they would like to see down the road. Member Steel stated when they go ahead to connecting people to places, maybe saying evading the inclusion of Parks and Recreation within the Comprehensive Plan so we understand it needs involvement from other Boards and Commissions. Mr. Minarik thought it was a great opportunity to include the Parks and Recreation Department.

Member McCormick asked if they needed to approve this now, she thought they could indicate this is a draft because she did not want to approve this draft and have people think the Board is approving the wording exactly as it shows in the draft. Mr. Minarik stated this is just a summary.

Member Segreto made the motion, seconded by Member Greene, approving the draft guiding principles and draft goals to provide feedback on guiding principles as presented.

Ayes: McCormick, Cella, Segreto, Gieseke, Steel, Jacobson, Jones, Greene

Motion carried.

VI.C. Redevelopment Planning Update for Grandview, Former Public Works Site – Bill Neuendorf, Economic Development Manager

Bill Neuendorf, Economic Development Manager, gave an update and presentation on the Grandview site. Dave Anderson from Frauenshuh & Companies was also at the meeting.

Member Jones asked if the City Council recommended the Park Board now be a part of this item because before the City Council indicated it would not be a part of the Park Board work plan but it would be a part of the Arts and Culture Commission work plan. Mr. Neuendorf stated at this point the project is under his management through the Administrative Department and they are reaching out to all of the boards and commissions. Ms. Kattreh replied this is not falling specifically on the work plan of the Park Board but thought the goal was to try to solicit input from all of the boards and commissions. It will fall under their umbrella and the Park Board will have more input on this. She noted it is very likely that a public space at Grandview will fall under the Parks & Recreation umbrella, whether it is a park facility, arts facility, an indoor/outdoor park or fitness center.

Member Jones stated she just wanted to clarify this for the audience watching because normally the Park Board would be involved in the planning and discussion of an item like this; however, they are not involved in any way in this process and are only hearing what the other boards and commissions are hearing. Ms. Kattreh thought there will be much more conversation about what goes in the public space, the conversation has not gotten to that level yet. Member Jones noted they are at the stage right now where all of the public meetings have been done and the scenarios are going to come back in a month and they are going to be responding to the scenarios but have not been a part of developing those scenarios. Member Steel stated they have not been involved but it seems like there is an opportunity now that the public input has been gathered. She did not know if it would have made sense if the Park Board would have directed the public process. She thought they would want the public to lead the process and there is an opportunity to have input.

Mr. Neuendorf continued with reviewing the process and where they are at today.

Member Jones asked if Mr. Neuendorf could define public and private to which Mr. Neuendorf replied to define public and private can be fairly black and white and then gave an example of public and private uses of land. Member Jones asked if public would be owned and operated by the city. Mr. Neuendorf stated most likely regarding ownership and operation; however, they have not even come to that point but it could work that way. He noted the word significant has been used a lot and there is a general acceptance of mixing public and private use for this land. There needs to be a significant public and a significant private piece. There is support for a public fitness facility with a recreational focus. There is support for a community arts and culture center. There is support for a performing arts center. He indicated there have been requests for improvements to the parks and to the open space from most groups. He added on the private side restaurants come up in almost every conversation.

Member Steel asked if there are any numbers on any of these items so they can see a break down on what people favored or how items were ranked. Mr. Neuendorf stated at this point they have not crunched any numbers and he was not sure if they would be able to do that because at the informal meetings he was taking down suggestions, not tabulating votes. He stated over fifty percent of the people indicated they do not need housing. Member Steel commented when it comes to this particular data those are the taxpayers so they need a comprehensive study on what the city can support or wants to support. She noted she liked the first presentation that was made; it was very helpful when the survey results were broken down. She noted these meetings are drawing the loudest and most active participants and she is interested in the city as a whole. Mr. Neuendorf stated that is a real good point and to address that concern, that is one of the reasons why they wanted to partner with a development expert and want to do a market study to see what the real market demand is out there. Member Steel thought it seemed like they are going to solidify the private part of this plan but was not sure by the timeline if they are going to solidify the public part of it so she was not sure the public was in agreement and behind this part of the plan. Mr. Neuendorf stated the next step in the process is to continue to collect data and then schedule another large group discussion to put things together and see what does

and what does not work well together as well as what fits on the site. He informed the Park Board that in April they will present at least three different development scenarios for review with an open house on April 22 and then in May they will continue taking public input on those options. They want to find a set of functions that work well together and create a place the city is proud of, the residents support and is financially stable.

Member Segreto indicated she was sensitive about the city's lack of an arts and culture center but it seems that all around them there are so many arts and culture centers that have performance space that maybe they are overbuilt in that regard. She stated they need to make sure that all of the other venues are being used before moving forward with another center. She thought that in order for the whole project to be successful what they do on the public side has to compliment what the market can support on the private side. She noted they have to be aware and they need to rely on their private partner to tell them what the project can support.

Member Jones stated she does not think apartments were the answer on this site and it was not instilling confidence in her by showing them that there is a high desire for apartments when the Morris Leatherman Survey clearly stated that it would be a deal breaker if apartments were proposed on that land. She added residents would not favor that. She noted the other thing that is not coming out is the fact that a great number of residents want to keep that land public and do not feel that a significant private presence is something they want on that land, it does not make sense with the residents. She stated this is one of the last large parcels of land that could be considered for a community center and to even consider taking off bits of it for apartment buildings that can be built elsewhere. She stated this would be the cheapest way to put in a community center in Edina because they already have the land and the land is centrally located. She did not understand this lack of understanding that the city is not going to invest in health and wellness when that is part of their strategic plan. She stated she was really frustrated that the City Council did not ask the Park Board for their help in planning this.

Member Steel was thinking of having a collaborative work space with a health and wellness theme to it where there would be walking treadmill desks, bike desks, standing desks, etc., which would serve the teenage community. She noted there are a lot of health and wellness opportunities and a lot of things that have not been done and there is room for partnerships with health companies. Member Segreto agreed that they have a lot of public needs and could utilize the entire space themselves. Member Segreto commented that she does not think the city could get this project done as quickly as they would like to unless they pair with a private developer. She noted to get the project done they are going to have to compromise and lose some public space.

Member Jones stated at this point she is not sure why they are rushing to say they need to build on that land because they do not know what is going to happen with the school referendum. She stated the City Council has never asked if they want to keep this one hundred percent public because that would have been the starting point. She stated all of the committees recommended that the city pursue what the public use would be first and for whatever reason the City Council is ignoring citizen requests and has decided to go down this other route which would mean there would be private use on the property. She stated the residents are asking for a community center.

Member Steel thought the problem is that there is not enough public support for this yet and until there is, it will not be built. Member Jones stated the way to establish consensus is to ask at a public meeting what the residents would like to see at a community center and that question has never been asked. Until the leadership is willing to ask that, there will never be consensus. Member Steel disagreed and stated there are four different types of public programming and there is not a consensus there so until

they start looking at the breakdown and numbers of the four types of programming they will not get a consensus. Member Jones stated it is possible there is room for all of those.

Mr. Neuendorf commented this discussion is very helpful and also reflective of most discussions he has been involved in. He stated the task given to him by the City Council is to look at a mixed use of public and private for this project. He noted there is definitely support for a community center but there was not support to pay for it, which is what led to this hybrid project. The private portion will help pay for the public portion of the project.

Member Jones indicated she chaired the Hornet's Nest Committee and in that committee they came to a public/private way of funding a public amenity and that was by leasing space for retail and a service business, which works really well with the city and arena. Their lease ends up paying for part of the building, capital cost and operational costs of the building. She noted by partnering with a private company they could make a community center affordable and that would give the city the most flexibility in the future and with what might change. Member Segreto stated the kind of public/private partnership where the city owns the whole project and lease increases the risk of the city and also requires that they get all of the financing.

Member Steel stated if they have concrete numbers to look at she thought they would have a better understanding of this project and it may make them all more confident.

Member Jacobson stated one thing she found most frustrating is that the Morris Leatherman survey did say the neighborhoods did not want apartments or condos and she thought the private part of the project will have to be housing because how could anything else support public, so that is what does not fit with her.

Member Gieseke stated there is a lot of emotional investment with different people. He thanked Mr. Neuendorf for the report and efforts. Mr. Neuendorf thanked the Park Board for their time and indicated he would be happy to come back in the future with another update.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

VII.A. Council Updates

No discussion.

VII.B. Veteran's Memorial Committee, October 31, 2014 and December 19, 2014

Approved Minutes

No discussion.

VIII. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

No discussion.

IX. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Kattreh updated the Park Board on Weber Woods and indicated the City of Edina and St. Louis Park received a counter offer from the City of Minneapolis.

Ms. Kattreh updated the Park Board on park dedication fees regarding the Byerly's Project and noted they will be receiving \$1,027,000 in park dedication fees to which \$665,000 is proposed to be invested in the Promenade Phase Four Project which will leave \$362,000 in park dedication fees. She noted they will also be receiving approximately \$500,000 from the Yorktown Continental Development.

Ms. Kattreh stated warming houses and skating rinks are still open. Staff is scheduled until early March.

Ms. Kattreh updated the Park Board on open board and commission seats and noted they will be expecting two new Park Board members in March.

X. *ADJOURNMENT*

Chair Geiseke made a motion, seconded by Member Greene, to adjourn the meeting at 8:49 p.m.

Ayes: Cella, Jones, Gieseke, Steel, Jacobson, McCormick, Segreto, Greene.

Motion Carried.

Meeting adjourned at 8:49 p.m.